

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO		
10/087,718	03/01/2002	Kishan Khemani	16096.6	7476		
22913	7590 04/25/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER		
	NYDEGGER	WOODWARD, A	WOODWARD, ANA LUCRECIA			
•	KMAN NYDEGGER (UTH TEMPLE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	GATE TOWER	1711				
SALT LAKE	CITY, UT 84111	DATE MAILED: 04/25/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/087,718		KHEMANI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary		Examiner		Art Unit	 		
		Ana L. Woo	dward	1711			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication						
Period for			A hree				
THE M/ - Extension after SI - If the pe - If NO pe - Failure to Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R ALLING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CK (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication from the mailing date of this communication from the mailing date of this communication from the maximum statutory provided for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory provided from the set or extended period for reply will, by the preceived by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no evention. , a reply within the statuto period will apply and will estatute, cause the applica	, however, may a reply be timery minimum of thirty (30) days expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ation to become ABANDONE	s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this comm D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.		
Status	·	. 1 /	. 1				
1) ⊠ R	esponsive to communication(s) filed on	2/9/2006	. 2/14/2001	6			
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on $\frac{3/9}{2006}$, $\frac{2}{14}/2006$ This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
<i>'</i>	, ,						
•	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
5)M C 6) \ \ C 7) \ C 8) \ C Application 9) \ Th 10) \ Th A	laim(s) is/are pending in the application (s) is/are pending in the application (s) is/are with laim(s) <u> is/are allowed.</u> laim(s) <u> is/are allowed.</u> laim(s) is/are rejected. laim(s) is/are objected to. laim(s) is/are subject to restriction and the specification is objected to by the Example drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	and/or election recommends miner. accepted or b) the drawing(s) be correction is required	uirement.] objected to by the Entered in abeyance. See if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR	• •		
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a) [cknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority docur Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But the attached detailed Office action for a	ments have been ments have been priority documen ureau (PCT Rule	received. received in Application ts have been receive 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Sta	age		
2) Notice of) of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94) tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S)	ite	52)		
	o(s)/Mail Date _2/1///)				

Application/Control Number: 10/087,718 Page 2

Art Unit: 1711

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
 - (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 1, 2, 6-12, 16-20, 24, 25, 27, 28 and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. 5,374,259 (Takahashi et al).

Takahashi et al disclose a biodegradable disposable diaper comprising a combination of a liquid absorbing material, a liquid permeable surface material and a leak-proof backing material, said liquid permeable material being formed of a biodegradable aliphatic polyester resin. The leak-proof backing material may be a film made from the same biodegradable polyester (column 7, lines 65-66). When the biodegradable polyester is used in the form of a film, the film may be formed by mixing a filler, such as calcium carbonate, extruding the film material into a film, stretching the film and effecting a staining emboss work, thereby obtaining a leak-proof material having high air permeability (column 8, lines 2-12 and column 12, lines 16-27). The film has a

Art Unit: 1711

thickness ranging from 20 to 50 micrometers and micro-pores formed by the stretching of the filler-containing material (column 8, lines 13-14).

It is reasonably believed that the particle filled-biodegradable films of Takahashi et al would necessarily possess all the characteristics governing the presently claimed single film layer, e.g., cavitations, dead-fold properties, etc., due to the presence of the particulate fillers and the processing techniques used to manufacture them. As to claims 31-33, it is reasonably believed that at least some of the filler particles would protrude from the surface of the sheet due to the orientation process, which causes cavitation and localized separation between the polymer matrix and individual filler particles. The onus is shifted to applicants to establish that the product of the present claims is not the same as or obvious from those set forth by Takahashi et al.

4. Claims 1-12, 15, 18-25, 27, 28 and 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. 6,231,970 (Andersen et al).

Andersen et al disclose thermoplastic starch compositions and films therefrom comprising a thermoplastic starch, inorganic filler and one or more additional thermoplastic polymers (abstract, examples, etc). Films or sheets formed from the compositions can been stretched after initial formation, in one or both directions (column 47, line 20, claim 86).

It is reasonably believed that the particle filled-biodegradable films of Andersen et al would necessarily possess all the characteristics governing the presently claimed single film layer, e.g., cavitations, dead-fold properties, etc., due to the presence of the particulate fillers and the processing techniques used to manufacture them. As to claims 31-33, it is reasonably

Application/Control Number: 10/087,718 Page 4

Art Unit: 1711

believed that at least some of the filler particles would protrude from the surface of the sheet due to the orientation process, which causes cavitations and localized separation between the polymer matrix and individual filler particles. The onus is shifted to applicants to establish that the product of the present claims is not the same as or obvious from those set forth by Andersen et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 3-5, 15 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,374,259 (Takahashi et al), described hereinabove, in view of US 5,817,721 (Warzelhan et al).

Takahashi et al differ, in essence, from the above-rejected claims in not expressly exemplifying the content of filler used and in not expressly disclosing the use of the composition in the production of film wraps. In both regards, attention is directed to Warzelhan et al who teach the conventionality of adding up to 80% by weight of fillers, such as calcium carbonate, to analogous biodegradable compositions useful in the production of diapers and packaging sheets (column 10, lines 17-22 and 40-55). Accordingly, both the use of filler amounts of up to 80% by weight and the production of packaging sheets would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

6. Claims 13, 14, 16, 17, 26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 6,231,970 (Andersen et al) described hereinabove.

Regarding the claims requiring the inclusion of both a stiff and a soft thermoplastic biodegradable polymer, attention is directed to examples 27-28 which additionally incorporate a

Application/Control Number: 10/087,718

Art Unit: 1711

stiff thermoplastic polymer, e.g., polylactic acid, etc., and render obvious said claimed subject matter.

As to claims 16 and 17, the film articles of the Andersen et al reference may be subjected to a plurality of post-formation processes, inclusive of creping, printing, etc. (column 47, lines 13-24), thus rendering obvious said claimed subject matter.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed February 6, 2006 have been fully considered and are persuasive to the extent that the rejections over Schiffer et al and Tsai et al have been withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 39-41 are deemed allowable over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ana L. Woodward whose telephone number is (571) 272-1082. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James J. Seidleck can be reached on (571) 272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/087,718 Page 6

Art Unit: 1711

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2179197 (poll-free).

Ana L. Woodward Primary Examiner Art Unit 1711
